

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 28-30, 32-37, and 39-41 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 28, 32-35, and 39-41.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 28-30, 35, and 36 by the Examiner.

Claims 32-34, 37, and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 32-34 and 39-41 to provide proper antecedent basis for the first and second "device dependent" colorant spaces. Applicant has also amended claims 28 and 35 to provide proper antecedent basis for first and second "device dependent" colorant spaces.

With respect to claim 37, "the set of colorants" refers to the "set of colorants" first recited in claim 28, line 5, as amended above. That is, "the set of colorants" recited in claim 37 does not refer to the "set of transformed colorants" (emphasis added) recited in claim 28, lines 8-9 or the "modified colorant set" (emphasis added) recited in claim 28, line 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the terminology in claim 37 clearly refers to the "set of colorants" recited in claim 28, line 5.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32-34, 37, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant has also amended claim 35 to more clearly provide proper antecedent basis for "the modified set of colorants" and amended 41 to more clearly recite that the step of converting an image represented in the first device dependent colorant space into an image represented in the second device dependent colorant space uses the modified table, not the modified colorant set. Support for the amendment to claim 41 can be found, for example, on page 11, line 30 through page 12, line 2 of Applicant's originally filed specification.

Claims 31 and 38 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as allegedly being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has canceled claims 31 and 38. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submits that the objection to claims 31 and 38 is moot.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28 and 35 are allowable. Claims 29, 30, 32-34, 36, 37, and 39-41 depend upon claims 28 and 35, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 28 and 35 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2009

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
  
Stephen R. Funk  
Registration No. 57,751